

## **REMARKS**

In conjunction with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, prior to addressing the rejections over the prior art, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that to correct an obvious grammatical error in the specification on page 8, lines 7-11, the applicant has amended the phrase "panel2 moved" to read --panel 2 is moved--.

Also to correct an obvious grammatical error, the applicant has amended the paragraph beginning on page 9, line 27, to page 10, line 2, to amend the phrase "because that the display panel" to read --because the display panel--.

No new matter has been added to the specification by either of the amendments.

To enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, the applicant has cancelled claim 1 without prejudice and has rewritten claim 2 into independent form including all of the limitations of cancelled claim 1.

Also to enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention, the applicant has cancelled claim 6 without prejudice and has rewritten claim 7 into independent form including all of the limitation of cancelled claim 6.

No new matter has been added by the amendments to claims 2 and 7. The applicant has not abandoned the subject matter of claims 1 and 6, and reserves the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

Correspondingly, the applicant has changed the dependency of claims 3 and 5 from cancelled claim 1 to now independent claim 2. Similarly, the applicant has changed the

dependency of claims 8 and 10 from cancelled claim 6 to now independent claim 7. No new matter has been added by the amendments to claims 3, 5, 8 and 10.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 1-10**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimura et al (JP-08-314389 - Unexamined Patent Publication November 29, 1996).

The Examiner asserts that Sugimura et al, FIGS. 1 and 2 disclose all of the limitations of claim 6. Specifically, the Examiner concedes that Sugimura et al do not appear to explicitly set forth a “spacer” inserted between a back face of the display panel and an inner main-face of the panel-mounting case, such that the display panel is placed in the predetermined panel-mounting case through at least one first spacer. The Examiner asserts however that Sugimura et al do illustrate members (7) in FIG. 4 that are integral with the display panel and these members (7) are fixed with bosses (13) formed on the inside bottom cover of the panel mounting case (5) in FIG. 2.

The Examiner further alleges that the members (7) presumably aid in fixedly holding the display panel (6) to the panel mounting case (5) through the bosses (13). The Examiner alleges that the information equipment of Sugimura can tilt (open and close) and thus the members (7) and bosses (13) are necessary to fixedly hold the display panel (6) to the panel mounting case (5).

The Examiner concludes that therefore, the Sugimura et al reference is evidence that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate spacers or members (7, 13) as functional equivalents of each other to fixedly support a display panel and panel mounting case when the device is opened and closed.

The Examiner further alleges that the bosses of Sugimura et al may function as second spacers.

The Examiner alleges that Sugimura et al disclose the limitations of claims 7-10 and that with respect to the method claims 1-5, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of information equipment at the time the invention was made in view of the structure as taught by Sugimura et al.

In response, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that claims 1 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

The applicant respectfully maintains that with respect to claim 7, the Examiner is not correct that the bosses 13 of Sugimura et al may function as second spacers.

The present invention of claim 7, and by analogy, claim 2, recites the limitations of --at least one second spacer for positioning and fixing said display panel along its up-and-down direction panel, wherefore said at least one second spacer is provided between a lower inner side face of said panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of said display panel--.

In contrast, it is evident from FIG. 2 of Sugimura et al that the bosses 13 are not provided between a lower inner side face of said panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of said display panel.

In addition, as is evident from FIG. 3, the bosses 13 cannot function as second spacers without the screws (vises) 6b.


In contrast, in the present invention recited by claims 2 and 7, the second spacers function without reciting the limitations of screws.

As a result, Sugimura et al do not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claims 2 and 7. Consequently, claims 2 and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claim 2-5 and 7-10 over the prior art.

The foregoing Amendment and Remarks, in conjunction with the accompanying Request for Continued Examination, establish the patentability of all of the claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 2-5 and 7-10. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco  
Registration No. 45,784

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:nis